

Application No: 10/666,340

Docket No.: Q137-US4

Page 11

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-28, 30, 34-70, 89, and 105 are canceled. Claims 84 and 100 are currently amended. Claims 29, 31-33, 71-83, 85-88, 90-99, 101-104, and 106-114 were previously presented. New claims 115-127 are added. Accordingly, claims 29, 31-33, 71-88, 90-104, and 106-127 are pending examination.

**Objection to the Specification**

The amendments to the Abstract reduce the number of words in the Abstract.

**Information Disclosure Statement**

As requested, Applicant has enclosed a clear copy of EP 0942484.

**Rejection of Claim 29 Under 35 USC §102**

Claim 29 stands rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,510,353 (McHenry). The language in claim 29 recites that an electrode strip extends through the mandrel slot. However, the Office Action appears to interpret the claim 29 as reciting that a pin extends through the mandrel slot rather than an electrode strip.

To illustrate that claim 29 recites that an electrode strip extends through the mandrel slot, note that claim 29 recites the following:

an electrode strip in electrical communication with the pin and an  
electrode strip electrically insulated from the pin.

The above text introduces two different electrode strips and also distinguishes them. For instance, the text indicates that one of the electrode strips is the "electrode strip in electrical communication with the pin" and that the other electrode strip is the "electrode strip electrically insulated from the pin." As a result, the above text provides the antecedent basis that the claims consistently use to distinguish the two electrode strips. For instance, claims 72, 73, and 74 each refers to the "electrode strip in electrical communication with the pin."

When we re-visit claim 29 and parenthesize the antecedent language that identifies the electrode strip we find the following limitation:

Application No: 10/666,340      Docket No.: Q137-US4

Page 12

the (electrode strip in electrical communication with the pin) extending through the mandrel slot.

As is evident from the parenthesis, this text requires that one of the electrode strips extends through the slot in the mandrel.

The Office Action argues that McHenry teaches a "pin [14], which extends through the mandrel slot." However, as noted above, claim 29 recites that an electrode strip extends through the mandrel slot. McHenry does not teach that an electrode strip extends through the mandrel slot and accordingly does not teach every element of claim 29. Since McHenry does not anticipate every element of claim 29, McHenry does not anticipate claim 29.

#### **Rejection of Claim 84 Under 35 USC §102**

The Office Action indicates that claim 89 would be allowable if re-written in independent form. In response, the Applicant has incorporated subject matter from claim 89 into independent claim 84.

#### **Rejection of Claim 100 Under 35 USC §102**

The Office Action indicates that claim 105 would be allowable if re-written in independent form. In response, the Applicant has incorporated subject matter from claim 105 into independent claim 100.

#### **Newly Added Independent Claim 115**

The Office Action indicates that claim 97 would be allowable if re-written in independent form. In response, the Applicant has incorporated subject matter from claim 97 into the newly added independent claim 115.

#### **Newly Added Independent Claim 122**

The Office Action indicates that claim 113 would be allowable if re-written in independent form. In response, the Applicant has incorporated subject matter from claim 113 into the newly added independent claim 122.

Application No: 10/666,340

Docket No.: Q137-US4

Page 13

**Double Patenting Rejection:**

Claims 29, 84, and 100 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 6, and 7 of U.S. Patent No. 6,670,071.

As noted above, claim 84 is amended to include subject matter from prior claim 89. Since prior claim 89 is not subject to this rejection, this rejection should be withdrawn with respect to claim 84.

As noted above, claim 100 is amended to include subject matter from prior claim 105. Since prior claim 105 is not subject to this rejection, this rejection should be withdrawn with respect to claim 105.

With respect to claim 29, the Applicant reserves the right to file a Terminal Disclaimer in the event that claim 29 is allowed.

Application No: 10/666,340      Docket No.: Q137-US4

Page 14

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant submits that the claims define patentably over the prior art and that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable consideration and allowance of this application is courteously requested.

The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned with any questions.



Travis Dodd  
Reg. No. 42,491  
Agent for Applicant(s)

Quallion LLC  
P.O. Box 923127  
Sylmar, CA 91392-3127  
818-833-2003 ph  
818-833-2065 fax  
travisd@quallion.com